

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated **March 2, 2010**. The Office Action rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al (US Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0178271) in view of Hearn (WO 03/003242).

With this response, claims 1, 4, 11, 14, and 21-22 have been amended. Claims 3 and 13 have been cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-22 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 1 has been amended to define an arrangement wherein each user is authenticated either as a super user or a normal user. If a user is a normal user, the user is able to modify the degree of access permitted by the user to data stored in a data storage medium, but only within parameters defined by the master access profile associated with the user. If the user is authenticated as a super user, the user is also able to modify the data access permissions defined by the master data access profile. A normal user, however, is not able to modify the master access data profile for the user in any way.

Support for the amendments made to claim 1 can be found at least at page 10, lines 35-36 and page 11, lines 1-29.

The significance of this arrangement is that it enables maximum permissions to be defined for different types of users. For example, only some users can access the internet or certain partitions or files in the data storage device. Also, within the boundaries defined by the relevant master access profile, a user has a degree of control of access permissions. For example, a current data access profile may be set up such that internet access can be restricted and malicious programs are prevented from communicating over the internet, but internet access is nevertheless possible by the user modifying the current access profile to allow internet access (assuming that the master access profile allows for this change).

By providing both a master access profile and a current access profile for a user, much greater access control is achieved while permitting some flexibility for users.

Independent claims 11, 21 and 22 have been amended similarly to claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Graham in view of Hearn. Neither Graham nor Hearn, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the access control system presented in the amended independent claims.

In particular, Hearn discloses a security system and method for computers. While this document references data access profiles, only a single data access profile is created for each user. *See* [[196]], [[203-208]], [[210]]. There is no teaching or suggestion in either reference providing multiple data access profiles for each user, let alone a master data access profile and a current data access profile modifiable within parameters defined by the master access profile.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure in either reference of authenticating super users and normal users, wherein only super users are able to modify parameters of a master access profile.

Therefore, Applicant believes that the rejection has been overcome and that the amended claims are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: September 2, 2010

By: /Martha J. Engel/
Martha J. Engel
Registration No.: 61534

6640 Shady Oak Rd., Suite 400
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7834
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001
f:\wpwork\mje\13340us01_amd_20100902.doc